



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,423	11/17/2003	Phillip Simmonds-Short	23742-012	2746
909	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			BERHANU, SAMUEL	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	
			2838	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,423

Applicant(s)

SIMMONDS-SHORT, PHILLIP

Examiner

Samuel Berhanu

Art Unit

2838

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933).

Regarding Claim 1, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14, a mobile device recharge station (1) (comprising: at least one docking station (17) for supplying at least one of power (Column 8, lines 56-63) and data (Column 13, lines 64-67) to a mobile device (18) (Column 8, lines 44-49); and a security system arranged to inhibit unauthorized removal of a mobile device from the at least one docking station (noted that the security system prohibits opening of the door if the key code is not matched with the previous registered key code, so the prior art teaches that unauthorized removal of a mobile device is prohibited, see also Figure 14, Column 18, lines 30-53)

Regarding Claim 2, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14, wherein the or each docking station comprises a container (16) having an openable closure (7) and a lock (27), and wherein the lock inhibits opening of the openable closure by unauthorized individuals (Column 18, lines 30-53 ).

Regarding Claim 3, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14, the security system includes a security controller for instructing a selected lock to release the openable

closure associated with the lock (Column 18, lines 30-53).

Regarding Claim 4, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14-15, a mobile where in the security system includes an access controller for selectively allowing access to a selected one of the or each recharge stations (since each compartment has door and the door is accessed by a secure means such as key code, the selected compartment by a user with a matched key ID, see Column 18, lines 30-53 and Column 20, lines 39-44, lines 55-57)

Regarding Claim 5, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14-15, the security system requires an individual to identify their right to remove a mobile device from one of the docking stations before the security system permits access to the appropriate docking station (Column 18, lines 30-53).

Regarding Claim 6, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14-15, the individual identifies themselves by way of one item selected from a list comprising: entering a pass code; providing a token; providing a key; and providing biometric data (Column 18, lines 30-53).

Regarding Claim 7, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14, the security system requires an individual to agree identity information with the security system at the time of depositing the mobile device (Noted that when the user enters key code to lock the compartment it is an indication that a user's argument with the security system requirement of the charging compartment).

Regarding Claim 8, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14, the individual

and the security system agree to identify information which comprises an item selected from a list comprising: a shared secret (Column 18, lines 30-53); a token; a key; and biometric data.

Regarding Claim 9, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14-15, a mobile device recharge station (1) further including payment collection device such that a payment can be collected for recharging the mobile device (Column 8, lines 5-13, Column 9, lines 27-44).

Regarding Claim 10, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14-15, a mobile device recharge station where the payment collection device includes at least one item selected from a list comprising: a credit/debit card reader

a coin collection mechanism (Column 8, lines 5-13, Column 9, lines 27-44).

a token collection mechanism

a data processor for raising a charge against an account.

Regarding Claim 18, Inoue et al. disclose in Figures 3-5 and 14, the docking stations are provided with connectors for connecting to mobile telephones (Column 8, lines 56-63).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2838

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933) in view of Fujitami et al. (2001/0024747).

Regarding Claim 11, Inoue et al. disclose all of the claim limitations except, the data processor is arranged to make a charge against a user's telephone account. However, Fujitami et al discloses in page 6, paragraph 60, the data processor is arranged to make a charge against a user's telephone account. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use as a mobile telephone account to collect charging station service fees as taught by Fujitami et al. in Inoue et al. mobile phone charging machine in order to provide simple, convenience and secure payment method.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933) in view of Bruning (US 6,756,765).

Regarding Claim 12, Inoue et al. do not disclose explicitly, an interface such that a user can identify the type of user device to the recharge station such that an appropriate power supply or suitably configured power supply is arranged to supply power to the mobile device. However, Bruning discloses in Figure 2, an interface (131) such that a user can identify the type of user device to the recharge station such that an appropriate power supply or suitably configured power supply is arranged to supply power to the mobile device (Column 4, lines 16-25). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a user interface

means as taught by Bruning in Inoue et al. charging station in order to provide a recommended charging power based on the user input parameters

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933) in view of Porter (US 6426699).

Regarding Claim 13, Inoue et al. disclose all of the claim limitations except; the security system asserts an alarm if an unauthorized removal of a mobile device is attempted. However, Porter discloses in Figures 1 and 2, the security system asserts an alarm if an unauthorized removal of a mobile device is attempted (Column 5, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a door lock control means such as an alarm or a bell as taught by Porter in Inoue et al. docking station in order to protect the station from intruders and to provide secure user friendly charging station

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933) in view of Hahn (US 5,847,541).

Regarding Claim 14, Inoue et al. do not disclose explicitly, a retention device for retaining the mobile device more securely in the event that an attempt is made to remove the mobile device. However, Hahn disclose in Figure 1, a retention device (26) for retaining the mobile device more securely in the event that an attempt is made to remove the mobile device. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a retention a device retention means in Inoue et al. charging station as taught by Hahn in order to protect unwanted device

removal from the battery charging docking station and protect the mobile device from being stolen.

8. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933) in view of Boutsikakis (US 20040242216).

Regarding 15, Inoue et al. disclose all of the claim limitations except, a user interface to enable a user to select data for transfer to or from the mobile device. Boutsikakis discloses in Figure 1, a user interface (40,48) to enable a user to select data for transfer to or from the mobile device (Page 3, Paragraph 0033). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a user communication means such as a display and a keypad as taught by Boutsikakis in Inoue et al. docking station in order to facilitate transmission of data between the electronic device and the charging station and also to provide a dedicated menu that walks the user through the necessary steps for effective and appropriate usage of the charging station.

Regarding claim 16, Boutsikakis discloses in Figure 1, the user interface includes a browser or menu driven interface such that the user can select their data transfer options (Page 3, Paragraph 0033).

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933) in view of Boutsikakis (US 20040242216) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Nuttall (US 6,202,056).



Regarding Claim 17, Neither Inoue et al. nor Boutsikakis discloses a payment accepting means for accepting payment for a data transfer. Nuttall discloses at Col 5, lines 26-41, a payment accepting means for accepting payment for a data transfer. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to collect fee associated with any data transfer from to the charging station as taught by Nuttall in order to ensure that fees are being collected for data transfer service.

10. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (US 5,744,933) in vie of Skowronski (US 6,926,130).

Regarding Claim 19, Inoue et al. disclose all of the claim limitations except; the docking stations are provided with connector for connecting to personal computing devices. However, Skowronski discloses in Figure 12, the docking stations (10) are provided with connector for connecting to personal computing devices (18) (Column 3, lines 49-67, Column 8, lines 34-51). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add an electrical connection means in Inoue et al. mobile phone charging machine in order to have multi purpose system which provides power to other electronic devices while charging a mobile phone.

Regarding Claim 20, Inoue et al. disclose all of the claim limitations except; the docking stations (10) are provided with connectors for connecting to personal entertainment devices (Column 3, lines 49-67, Column 8, lines 34-51).


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel Berhanu whose telephone number is 571-272-8430. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on 571-272-1989. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SB

  
KARL D. EASTHOM  
PRIMARY EXAMINE